

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 11-24 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 9 are amended. No new matter is added.

Support for the Amendment to claims 1 and 9 is found, at least in FIG. 2, FIG. 3, and the Disclosure.

It is respectfully submitted that entry of the amendment is proper as the amendment would place the application in condition for allowance or at least present the claims in better form for appeal. Further, the amendments do not raise new issues requiring more than nominal consideration by the Examiner.

For the following reasons, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS:

On page 2, item 3 of the Office Action, claim 3 is objected to as improperly dependent as failing to further limit the claim from which it depends. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that the scope of claim 3 is different from the scope of claim 1. Specifically, claim 3 defines a folded portion provided at the uncoated portion. On the other hand, claim 1 defines a folded portion provided on at least one edge of at least one of the first electrode plate and the second electrode plate.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 3 are of different scope. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

On page 2, item 4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 5, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Toyokazu et al. (JP Patent Application Publication No. 11-135101). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Toyokazu fails to disclose or suggest an electrode unit, wherein the folded portion is formed to be the same width as the at least one of the first electrode plate and the second electrode plate, as defined in claim 1.

Rather than the folded portion that is formed to be the same width as the at least one of the first electrode plate and the second electrode plate, Toyokazu discloses an uncoated portion

4 having a fold 5 that is formed at a 45-degree inclination from the edge of an electrode to help create a portion 1a that extends well beyond the width of the plate by a subsequent fold 6 (see, for example, machine translation at paragraphs [0008], [0009] and FIGS. 1, 2a, 2b, and 5 of Toyokazu). The extending portion 1a creates a folded portion that is not the same width as the plate in Toyokazu.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the applied reference to Toyokazu. Claims 3, 5, 21, and 22, which depend from claim 1, are likewise patentably distinguishable over the applied reference for at least the reasons discussed above, and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

On page 4, item 6 of the Office Action, claims 2, 6, 9, 12-14, 16-20, 23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Toyokazu, in view of Iwasaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,325,611). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Toyokazu fails to disclose or suggest a secondary battery, wherein the folded portion is formed to be the same width as the at least one of the first electrode plate and the second electrode plate, as defined in claim 9.

Rather than the folded portion that is formed to be the same width as the at least one of the first electrode plate and the second electrode plate, Toyokazu discloses an uncoated portion 4 having a fold 5 that is formed at a 45-degree inclination from the edge of an electrode to help create a portion 1a that extends well beyond the width of the plate by a subsequent fold 6 (see, for example, machine translation at paragraphs [0008], [0009] and FIGS. 1, 2a, 2b, and 5 of Toyokazu). The extending portion 1a creates a folded portion that is not the same width as the plate in Toyokazu.

Iwasaki fails to overcome the deficiency of Toyokazu as to render claim 9 obvious. Accordingly, claim 9 is patentably distinguishable over the applied references to Toyokazu and Iwasaki. Claims 2 and 6, which depend from claim 1, and claims 12-14, 16-20, 23, and 24, are likewise patentably distinguishable over the applied references for at least the reasons discussed above, and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

On page 6, item 7 of the Office Action, claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Toyokazu, in view of Hisashi (JP Patent Application Publication No. 10-

261438). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Toyokazu fails to disclose each and every feature of claim 1 from which claim 4 depends. Hisashi fails to overcome the deficiency of Toyokazu as to render claim 1 obvious. Accordingly, claim 4 is patentably distinguishable over the applied references for at least its dependence from claim 1, and for the additional features it recites. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

On page 7, item 8 of the Office Action, claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Toyokazu, in view of Narukawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,508,122). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Toyokazu fails to disclose each and every feature of claim 1 from which claim 8 depends. Narukawa fails to overcome the deficiency of Toyokazu as to render claim 1 obvious. Accordingly, claim 8 is patentably distinguishable over the applied references for at least its dependence from claim 1, and for the additional features it recites. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

On page 8, item 9 of the Office Action, claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Toyokazu, in view of Iwasaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,325,611) as applied to claim 9, and further in view of Hisashi. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Toyokazu and Iwasaki fail to disclose each and every feature of claim 9 from which claim 11 depends. Hisashi fails to overcome the deficiency of Toyokazu and Iwasaki so as to render claim 9 obvious. Accordingly, claim 11 is patentably distinguishable over the applied references for at least its dependence from claim 9, and for the additional features it recites. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

On page 8, item 10 of the Office Action, claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Toyokazu, in view of Iwasaki, as applied to claim 9, and further in view of Narukawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,508,122). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Toyokazu and Iwasaki fail to disclose each and every feature of claim 9 from which claim 15 depends. Narukawa fails to overcome the deficiency of Toyokazu and Iwasaki so as to render claim 9 obvious. Accordingly, claim 15 is patentably distinguishable over the applied references for at least its dependence from claim 9, and for the additional

features it recites. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 10/10/2007

By:


Seth S. Kim
Registration No. 54,577

1400 Eye St., N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510